

REMARKS

The Official Action of March 1, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1, 4-12, 14 and 16-18, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 2, 3 and 15 have been cancelled, wherein the features of claims 2 and 3 have been added to independent claim 1 and the features of claim 15 have been added to independent claim 14.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the undersigned during a June 1, 2006, telephone conference and his indication in his February 1, 2006, Office Action that claims 9 and 15 would be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. In response to his indication regarding claims 9 and 15, Applicant has added the features of independent claim 1 and dependent claim 8 to allowable claim 9, and the features of allowable claim 15 to independent claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 9 and 14 are now allowable along with claims 16-18 dependent from claim 14.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-6, 8, 14 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nightingale in view of Glodin, and claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nightingale and Glodin in view of Herber. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as applied to claim 1 as amended to include the features of canceled claims 2 and 3.

The claimed invention is primarily directed to a unitary molding comprising a cage and rollers engaged together by a lubricant which is engageable or disengageable from an assembled cylindrical race as shown in Fig. 2 of the application.

It is normally difficult to fill a solidifying lubricant into a race similar to that shown in Fig. 2 because the outer ring is blocked at the axially opposite ends by a flange of a stud and a circular plate fitted over the stud.

To cope with this problem, the solidifying lubricant has been poured into the race after dismantling the circular plate, and then reassembling the circular plate on the stud after the lubricant has solidified in the race. This system requires large scale machinery and complicated process control.

As seen, the claimed unitary molding overcomes lubricant replacement problems in a unique manner patentably distinct from that taught by the cited prior art.


Appln. No. 10/786,287
Amdt. dated June 1, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2006

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\O\Onak\Kato28\pto\Amendment-AF.doc